

Members

Matthew Fox (Co Chair)
University District Community Council

Zac Eskenazi (Co Chair)
Eastlake Community Council

Jan Arntz
University of Washington Staff

Alex Bolton
University of Washington At-Large

Kirsten Curry
Laurelhurst Community club

Dave Eckert
Roosevelt Neighbor's Alliance

Ashley Emery
University of Washington Faculty

Brett Frosaker
Ravenna Bryant Community Assoc

Daniel Nguyen
University of Washington Students

Lionel Job
Montlake Community club

Eric Larson
Roosevelt Neighbor's Alliance

Louis Little
Greater University District Chamber of commerce

Cameron Miller
Wallingford Community council

Barbara Quinn
University Park Community Club

Betty Swift
Portage Bay/Roanoke Community council

Alternates

Jorgen Bader
University District Community Council

Kerry Kahl
University of Washington Staff

Ray Larson
University of Washington At-Large

Chris Leman
Eastlake Community Council

Heather Newman
Laurelhurst Community Club

Tom Roth
Ravenna Springs Community Council

Ruedi Risler
University Park Community Council

Sharon Scully
University District Community Council

Larry Sinnott
Ravenna Bryant Community Association

Matthew Stubbs
University of Washington

Ex-Officio Members

Steve Sheppard – DON
City of Seattle, Dept. of Neighborhoods

Theresa Doherty – UW
University of Washington, Office of Regional Affairs

City of Seattle - University of Washington Community Advisory Committee

Meeting Notes

Meeting # 128

October 8, 2013

UW Tower

4333 Brooklyn Avenue

Seattle, WA 98105

22nd Floor

Members and Alternates Present

Matt Fox

Betty Swift

Ashley Emery

Zac Eskenazi

Barbara Quinn

Brett Frosaker

Kerry Kahl

Staff and Others Present

Steve Sheppard

Theresa Doherty

Editor's Note: This was a relatively short meeting dealing with a single topic.

I. **Welcome and Introductions** The meeting was opened by Matt Fox. Brief Introductions followed.

II. **Housekeeping**

The minutes for meetings 126 and 127 were adopted without substantive changes..

III. **CUCAC comments on Department of DPD U-District Urban Design Framework EIS Scoping**

Matt Fox noted that he had attended the EIS scoping meeting for the District Urban Design Framework. He noted that the majority of the meeting mirrored discussions that had occurred at CUCAC in I in the previous meeting. Mr. Fox noted that there was additional information presented on alternatives. There are three alternatives. The first alternative is "no action" which would retain the existing mid-rise zoning adopted in the neighborhood plan in 1998-1999. DPD mentioned that the existing zoning provides sufficient development opportunities to meet growth targets. There are two action alternatives which: 1) allow buildings up to 160 ft. which is a significant increase to the 65 ft. height limit and 2) allow buildings up to 300 ft.

Mr. Fox noted that the EIS will have a preferred alternative and a no-action alternative. The preferred alternative has not yet been identified and the DPD consultant did not identify such. The scoping process will determine the preferred alternative. Mr. Fox suggested that CUCAC weigh in on the alternatives once the DEIS is issued. Mr. Fox noted that since public comments affect the choice of the preferred alternative, that both CUCAC and the broader community should weigh on this issue.

Mr. Fox presented a rough draft of points for a letter that he suggested is written on CUCAC's behalf. Brief discussions followed. Neither Mr. Fox noted that CUCAC had formally endorsed further study of the public plaza in conjunction with the light rail station and had requested that neither the City nor University take actions that would preclude this consideration.. He noted that this was an important element in the suggested CUCAC letter and that this position should be reiterated and reinforced in CUCAC's comment letter during this scoping period, He also suggested that CUCAC should continue to monitor this process and advocate for full consideration of the plaza during its upcoming meetings. Mr. Fox requested an extension of time on this EIS scoping deadline so the committee can get the comments in time.

Mr. Fox stated that it was his opinion that that the 300 ft. alternative should not become the preferred alternative in the EIS. Members agreed and noted that it was never the intention that the whole area will be a 300 ft. terrace. Mr. Fox informed the committee that it is not quiet defined yet. Other's outlined the schedule for future actions. The draft EIS which will be out in spring of 2014; then there is a final EIS. There are several different opportunities for public comment.

Members suggested that any scoping comments from CUCAC include the Committee's concerns with any 300 foot alternative. Mr. Sheppard noted that this type of comment should be made in response to the Draft EIS. Members stated that CUCAC should formally note that a full analysis of this issue should be conducted.

Committee members then outlining the items they would like to include in its scoping comments. This includes the need to identify the preferred alternative, land use plans and policies, evaluation of the potential impact of 300 ft. height proliferation of office tower development, and full evaluation of ways to assure that any proposed height bonuses apply only to residential development, and also the issue concerning open space.

Matt Fox asked the committee to vote on submitting the document as amended. The committee unanimously voted to submit the document as amended. (Note: The letter as amended and sent is attached to these minutes.

V. Adjournment

No further business being before the Committee; the meeting was adjourned.

Attachment: CUCAC Scoping Comment Letter

Members

Matthew Fox (Co Chair)
University District Community Council

Zac Eskenazi (Co Chair)
Eastlake Community Council

Jan Arntz
University of Washington Staff

Alex Bolton
University of Washington At -Large

Kirsten Curry
Laurelhurst Community Club

Dave Eckert
Roosevelt Neighbor's Association

Ashley Emery
University of Washington Faculty

Brett Frosaker
Ravenna Bryant Community Assoc.

Daniel Hguyen
University of Washington Students

Lionel Job
Montlake Community Club

Eric Larson
Roosevelt Neighbor's Alliance

Louise Little
Greater University District Chamber of Commerce

Cameron Miller
Wallingford Community Council

Barbara Quinn
University Park Community Council

Betty Swift
Portage Bay/Roanoke Community Council

Alternates

Kerry Kahl
University of Washington Staff

Ray Larson
University of Washington At-Large

Chris Leman
Eastlake Community Council

Heather Newman
Laurelhurst Community Club

Ruedi Risler
University Park Community Council

Tom Roth
Ravenna Springs Community Council

Sharon Scully
University District Community Council

Larry Sinnott
Ravenna Bryant Community Assoc.

Matthew Stubbs
University of Washington

Ex-Officio Members

Steve Sheppard – DON
City of Seattle, Dept. of Neighborhoods

Theresa Doherty – UW
University of Washington, Office of Regional Affairs

City of Seattle - University of Washington Community Advisory Committee

October 2013

Dave LaClergue, Urban Designer
City of Seattle
Department of Planning and Development
700 5th Avenue, Suite 2000
Seattle, WA 98124

REGARDING: CUCAC Comment on the Scope of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the U-District Urban Design Framework

Dear Mr. LaClergue,

The City of Seattle - University of Washington Community Advisory Committee (CUCAC) was established by joint agreements between the City of Seattle and the University of Washington. CUCAC includes formally appointed representation from all Greater University District Community organizations and the faculty students and staff of the University of Washington. The purpose of CUCAC is in part "... to advise the City and the University on the orderly physical development of the greater University area; to encourage the provision of adequate City services to the University and adjacent community and business areas; to assist the University and City in preserving the many positive aspects of the University's presence in the community..." In this capacity CUCAC has received periodic briefings on the U-District Urban Design Framework.

CUCAC's October 2013 meeting was entirely devoted to a discussion of the scope of the EIS for this issue. The discussion focused on the possible environmental and economic impacts associated with the increased development capacities included in the various action alternatives to be studied in the DEIS, and particularly on identifying possible impacts on adjacent lower-density neighborhoods.

CUCAC offers the following Specific Comments to the EIS Scoping:

1. Concerning Identification of a preferred Alternative - CUCAC remains concerned over the possible adverse effects of greater allowed heights, and particularly of 300 foot height. Members urge that the Draft EIS not immediately identify a specific preferred alternative, and that instead the specific proposed action be identified following publication of the Final EIS and further consultation with the various groups. CUCAC would like to be included in that process.
2. Concerning Land Use Plans and Policies –
 - A) The DEIS should include a detailed evaluation of the effects of greater height and density within the study area and more broadly into adjacent neighborhoods. The specific concern is over the possible pressure for

conversion from low-rise residential to mid and high-rise development over time.

- B) The DEIS should evaluate the potential impact of 300 foot height on possible proliferation of office tower development, and identify policy and regulatory mechanisms to preclude this occurring. Note that CUCAC is concerned that the University District remain a primarily residential neighborhood and not evolve into a “Central Business District North” or South Lake Union-type area.
 - C) The DEIS should include a full evaluation of ways to assure that any proposed height bonuses apply only to residential development and the effect of any height bonuses on the possible proliferation of Office development and displacement of residential uses.
 - D) The DEIS should include an evaluation of the economic impacts associated with the potential gift of value implicit with the proposed up zones and identify a package of required public benefits to be associated with the up zones.
 - E) The Draft EIS should include an evaluation of possible downzones or other mechanisms to assure that increased heights or other bonuses focused around the future light rail station, do not result in the spread of increased development pressure throughout the neighborhood as envisioned in Alternative 3 (the “No-Action” scenario).
 - F) The Draft EIS should evaluate the possible loss of the smaller pedestrian-scale businesses along University Way and identify ways to retain this important character. CUCAC has serious reservations about any proposals to up zone directly along University Way that could undermine the existing pedestrian-friendly scale of the existing neighborhood and business district.
3. Concerning Open Space -CUCAC reiterates its support for further study of the concept of a public plaza/open space in conjunction with the future light rail station, and that our position remains that the University of Washington and Sound Transit should not take any actions on their properties that would foreclose this option.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. We look forward to working with you in the Future

Sincerely,



Matt Fox, (Co Chair)

Signature authorization on file with the Department of Neighborhoods
Zac Eskenazi (Co Chair)

Via e-mail